	Case 1:23-cv-01730-KES-CDB Docume	ent 18 Filed 08/28/25 Page 1 of 3						
1								
1								
2								
<i>3</i>								
5								
6								
7								
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
10								
11	GERONIMO MEJIA,	Case No. 1:23-cv-01730-KES-CDB (HC)						
12	Petitioner,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND						
13	v.	RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORDUS WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR						
14	TRENT ALLEN,	CORPUS WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDERS						
15	Respondent.	Doc. 17						
16								
17	Geronimo Mejia is a state prisoner pr	roceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a petition						
18	for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Doc. 1. The matter was referred to a							
19	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.							
20	On June 24, 2025, following a prelim	ninary screening of the petition, the assigned						
21	magistrate judge ordered petitioner to file an	amended petition to remedy certain identified						
22	deficiencies. Doc. 15. When petitioner failed to timely comply with the Court's screening order							
23	or make any other filing by the deadline, the magistrate judge issued findings and							
24	recommendations, recommending dismissal	without prejudice for petitioner's failure to obey						
25 26	court orders and failure to prosecute this action. Doc. 17. Those findings and recommendations							
26 27	were served upon petitioner and contained no	otice that any objections thereto were to be filed						
2728	within fourteen (14) days after service. Petit	tioner did not file objections and the time to do so has						
20								

Case 1:23-cv-01730-KES-CDB Document 18 Filed 08/28/25 Page 2 of 3

expired.1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

26

28

///

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

The Court next turns to whether a certificate of appealability should issue. Generally, a certificate of appealability may be issued under 28 U.S.C. § 2253 "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). Where, as here, the petition is dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability "should issue only if the prisoner can show: (1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling'; and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional rights." Rosas v. Nielsen, 428 F.3d 1229, 1233 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). A certificate of appealability is appropriate only where both inquires are satisfied. Murray v. Schriro, 745 F.3d 984, 1002 (9th Cir. 2014). Here, petitioner has not made a showing that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition should be dismissed on procedural grounds. Accordingly, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. /// /// /// /// /// ///

²⁴ ¹ On August 21, 2025, the U.S. Postal Service returned the Court's mail as "Undeliverable, 25

Return to Sender, Refused, Unable to Forward, Inactive, No Longer at Salinas Valley State Prison." The California Incarcerated Records and Information Search (CIRIS) tool produced no results using Petitioner's first and last name and CDCR Number, indicating Petitioner no longer is

in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). See

²⁷ https://ciris.mt.cdcr.ca.gov/results?lastName=mejia&firstName=geronimo &

https://ciris.mt.cdcr.ca.gov/results?cdcrNumber=BR5345 (last visited August 27, 2025). Nevertheless, the Court's service is deemed fully effective pursuant to Local Rule 182(f).

	Case 1:23-cv-01730-KES-	-CDB	Document 18	Filed 08/28/25	Page 3 of 3			
1	Based upon the foregoing, the Court ORDERS:							
2	1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 6, 2025, Doc. 17, are							
3	ADOPTED	in full.						
4	2. The petition	n for wri	t of habeas corpu	s, Doc. 1, is DISMIS	SSED WITHOUT			
5	PREJUDIC	PREJUDICE for failure to prosecute and to obey court orders.						
6	3. The Clerk o	The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the case.						
7	4. The Court d	4. The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.						
8								
9								
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.			Lith &	1- 11			
11	Dated: August 28, 2	025	_	· ·				
12				UNITED STATES 1	DISTRICT JUDGE			
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								